

Senator DOMENICI and the Budget Committee of the Senate and Senator DOLE, our leader. On all the votes that have come along, there have been efforts to untangle that budget that have been apple-pie-and-motherhood votes to add this on or add that on.

I have voted with Senator DOMENICI to hold together that budget package because I feel it is the best budget we have had in my 21 years in Congress. It is the first time we have had a budget that has a vision to move us to a balanced budget by the year 2002. That does not say we are paying anything on the Federal debt. We are not. We still have that huge debt to deal with. It does not say anything that we are going to get into a balanced budget until 2002. We are still engaging in deficit spending until 2002.

What is the big fight about here in town? The President of the United States campaigned on a platform to balance the budget within 5 years. I remember Jimmy Carter's was he was going to balance the budget in 4 years during the time he was President. Ronald Reagan campaigned on a program to balance the budget. Every Member of this Senate has run for the Senate on a program to balance the budget.

The point is, it goes on and on and on, and there are excuses and there are phony numbers, there are CBO numbers, there are these numbers, that numbers. But the American people have said, enough is enough, get on with a plan. There are going to be some people in this segment of the economy angry, some people in that segment.

I think it just takes an across-the-board approach. I think the Domenici-Dole budget has some flaws in it. There are some things in it I disagree with but, generally speaking, it cuts the rate of increase. Some of these programs have been increasing at 12 percent a year. This reduces the rate of increase to between 5 and 7 percent.

With that rate of increase, we can absorb the increases and bring us to a balanced budget. So when we talk about cuts, for the most part, we are not talking about cuts at all. We are talking about increasing at a slower level, but still increasing probably at the rate of inflation. So at least let us get with it. At least let us do it. And I hope our leadership does not compromise away this work and these votes that we have cast this year. I hope we stick to our guns and stick to this plan that has been put forward, which I call the Domenici-Dole budget.

Mr. President, let me say something about middle-class working people. One way or another, they end up paying most of the taxes in this country. I think that is unfortunate. I am a member of the Finance Committee, and I have tried to change that. There are promises about a flat-rate tax in the future, and there are promises about a tax on consumption instead of income taxes in the future. But it will still end up that those families or those individuals who work hard, obey the law, they

end up pulling the wagon. They are the ones paying for this nonsense, and they are the ones out there who helped elect this new Congress. In frustration, they are saying, "Let us do something about this."

Mr. President, I think it is time for us to do something. I hope to continue to be a part of that. I ask our leadership not to make compromises that are unnecessary, that go beyond the framework of the Domenici-Dole budget, that would leave us, once again, going away from here with the American people being promised that there is going to be a balanced budget and there is not. I hope that the President and the Congress will heed the American people.

I thank the Chair for this opportunity to speak.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I understand that the Democratic leader no longer wishes to speak at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:51 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair; whereupon, the Senate reassembled at 5:19 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me first state, since I have told my colleagues I would inform them when we had any information, the negotiation is still ongoing as far as the continuing resolution is concerned. I think we made a lot of progress this afternoon. That is how I would characterize the exchange.

We have exchanged options. We have now given an option to Senator DASCHLE, who I understand will be discussing it with Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, and Mr. GEPHARDT, the Democratic leader in the House. Hopefully, we can, as I said earlier, resolve this this evening.

If so, I think the process would be we would pass a 1-day continuing resolution, send it to the House, which they could act on tonight. Then we would hopefully pass the other agreed resolution in the Senate tonight, and they would take that up in the House tomorrow. Those are tentative indications of what would happen.

But I wanted to speak about another very important matter.

PEACE TALKS IN DAYTON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there are news reporters indicating that the administration is trying to wrap up peace talks in Dayton, OH, by tomorrow morning.

No doubt about it, the administration has put a great deal of effort into this diplomatic process. A significant number of our diplomats have been working around the clock to get an agreement. Their hard work should be recognized.

However, I hope that in their understandable haste, our negotiators will not lose sight of the objective—which is not just to secure a peace, but to secure a just and lasting peace.

Most Members of Congress would agree that for an agreement to have a reasonable prospect of achieving a stable peace, it must include the following provisions:

First, a clear demarcation of defensible borders for Bosnia and Herzegovina and resolution of all territorial issues among the parties;

Second, clear lines of demarcation between the military forces of the parties to the agreement and procedures for separating the forces;

Third, concurrence by all parties and witnesses to the agreement to multilateral lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina upon entry into force of the agreement;

Fourth, acceptance by all parties and witnesses to the agreement to United States involvement in an effort to equip, arm, and train Bosnian Federation Forces;

Fifth, establishment of clear standards for violations of the agreement and the unrestricted use of force by NATO to include air power as necessary to respond to violations of the agreement which threaten not only the peace, but the security of our forces;

Sixth, an end to military intervention by the Governments of Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Seventh, the dismantlement of the integrated air defense network linkages between Serbia and Bosnian-Serb held areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Eighth, full NATO implementation of the deny flight operation; and

Ninth, measures to ensure that indicted war criminals are not in positions of authority, including any elected office.

Mr. President, it seems to me that these are the minimum elements of a viable peace agreement. Without these elements, it is unlikely that a genuine peace will hold. Without these elements, it is unlikely that Bosnia will survive.

We should not mistake securing any peace agreement in Dayton with securing a stable peace. No matter how difficult the negotiations are, if they fail to achieve an agreement that secures the integrity and independence of Bosnia they will have been a waste of time.

Also essential to a stable peace is restoring public confidence and trust in the Government, institutions, and leaders of Bosnia. Absent justice, there will be no trust and no peace will endure. For the long-suffering Bosnian people, to believe in the peace, they

must witness for themselves that justice will be done in Bosnia. Justice is the only comfort we can provide to mothers and fathers who have lost their children to war crimes. This will not be a just peace if war criminals remain at large and unaccountable for their heinous crimes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, any peace will be short-lived if it does not provide the Bosnians with the authority and the means to defend their territory and their people. Absent a stable military balance, those who have clearly been the aggressors in this conflict will seek to press their advantage again. Whatever agreement is initialed in Dayton, it must provide for lifting the arms embargo and for addressing the existing military imbalance. If it does not, it will serve no greater purpose than to delay an inevitable return to hostilities. It will simply be another invitation to future aggression.

Placing these important matters aside, foremost on the minds of the American people is whether or not young Americans should be ordered to enforce a peace agreement in Bosnia.

Mr. President, in my view, the deployment of American forces into harms' way requires very careful deliberation on the part of the administration and the Congress. The President has informed me that he will come to Congress for support. That is the right thing to do. It would be unwise to send American forces without the support of the Congress and the American people. Right now, I do not believe that the President has it.

He certainly will not have it, if a peace agreement does not include the provisions I have mentioned. But, he is also unlikely to receive our support if the implementation plan for our military forces does not, at the very least, include the following essential provisions:

First, well-defined and clearly stated mission objectives achievable through military means;

Second, robust rules of engagement allowing for disproportionate responses, as appropriate, to any attacks on United States and NATO forces and no restrictions or impediments on the ability of United States and NATO military forces to defend themselves;

Third, United States military forces will operate only under a unified NATO command whose orders and authority cannot be constrained, conditioned, blocked or vetoed by any other party including the United Nations;

Fourth, United States military forces shall use the authority granted in any annexes to the maximum extent consistent with their resources and shall act to deter, defeat or punish any violations from whatever source;

Fifth, clear criteria for measuring progress toward achieving the objectives of the operation, a detailed exit strategy, and adequate resources for achieving these objectives and effecting a safe exit for all United States forces from Bosnia;

Sixth, procedures for integrating appropriate UNPROFOR forces currently in Bosnia into a NATO-led implementation force and procedures for withdrawing any other UNPROFOR forces from Bosnia; and

Seventh, specific provisions to prevent conflict between United States and non-NATO Forces and members of the civilian population of Bosnia.

Mr. President, I believe that these criteria are very simple and very basic. I am not certain that Congress will go along with sending American Forces even if these provisions are included in a peace agreement and implementation plan. However, I am certain that without these elements, not only will Congress overwhelmingly disapprove of the peace agreement and the plan to send American Forces as peacekeepers, but that neither of these plans will have a chance of succeeding.

The administration says that NATO will collapse if the United States does not send Americans into Bosnia as peacekeepers, but what happens to NATO if Americans are used to keep a peace which cannot be kept? What happens if we send Americans without adequate authority and provision to protect themselves? NATO should remain strong and united, however, unity in failure is the worst possible outcome. How much worse off would NATO be if United States and other NATO Forces were deployed in Bosnia only to leave in failure?

Which brings me to my final question: Why this option? Why is sending 20,000 American troops to Bosnia the only option being considered by the Clinton administration? Why was no consideration given to using American air power and American supply lines for ground forces provided by our European allies?

Mr. President, many questions remain. The President has not yet made the case for American involvement in Bosnia on this massive scale. The Congress has clearly stated its view that the President should seek authorization for any deployment to Bosnia. The Congress has also clearly stated its preference for lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia so that Bosnians may defend themselves. And we have done this time after time after time on a bipartisan basis. Many of us who supported lifting the embargo, did so not just because of our support for Bosnia's inherent right to self-defense, because we hoped we could avoid sending thousands of Americans into Bosnia to defend Bosnians. But, the President chose not to do that—and now we are where we are.

Mr. President, we fully understand the constitutional authority of the President of the United States. We also understand the constitutional responsibility of the Congress. There is no greater responsibility for an elected representative than to prevent the needless shedding of American blood. We intend to exercise that responsibility with the utmost care.

Mr. President, I want to particularly thank the Presiding Officer for his efforts not only in helping me prepare this statement, but for his consistent support for the position that I have outlined here and for his leadership on the Senate floor and in the Senate negotiations on both sides of the aisle.

I appreciate very much his help.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the distinguished leader departs here momentarily, I would like to join in acknowledging the Presiding Officer's very active participation in this and a broad range of matters relating to the military. He served on the Armed Services Committee with great distinction.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to bring up the subject of the appropriations bill. I addressed the distinguished majority leader earlier today. We had indications that the President might sign two of the three pending appropriations bills.

But at this hour there seems to be still some doubt as to whether or not he will sign the Defense appropriations bill which, as the majority leader recalls, the distinguished Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, being chairman and ranking members of that committee, put through with a very strong vote.

It would seem to me inconsistent. It seems to me if the President were thinking about a further commitment, a commitment for which I still have serious reservation, of ground troops into that theater that you would need to have as a foundation the signing of the Defense appropriations bill.

There are \$647 million in that bill for the specific purpose of contingency operations—not included in Bosnia but other operations, and should you put a further financial burden on the defense budget without the allocation of those funds for the ongoing, it seems to me to be just an inconsistent operation. I hope that this message would go to the White House at this moment.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the defense appropriations bill.

It has also been expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, I think in a conversation earlier today with Senator WARNER, a telephone conversation. I understand the President was going to sign legislative appropriations and Treasury, Postal appropriations about 5 o'clock today. I hope he has done that. That would mean, if we do not come together on a continuing resolution, which I think we will, that those people could be back at work.

But I would underscore what the Senator from Virginia has stated. If the President is thinking about it—and I know he is thinking about it—any deployment in Bosnia, it seems to me he would be in a much stronger position—I leave that judgment to him because I have not made a judgment yet on that